

Remarks.

The Examiner's comments and objections and the cited references have been carefully considered by the Applicant.

New claims have been drafted for overcoming the objections at paragraph 1 and 2 of the Office Action and are herewith submitted for the Examiner's approval.

The specification has been amended to provide terminological support for the newly submitted claims.

Claim 1 has been deemed unpatentable, and rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over Kawasaki et al in view of Tinsley, or the stated prior art in view of Tinsley.

A new main claim 10 has been drafted to set forth a container comprising in combination a **box shaped body having a polygonal plan cross-section and a coil covering panel having a central circular opening and a contour with angular portions matching the inner plan shape of the body which is freely descendable in the box shaped body.**

The new claimed combination of features is believed to be inventive over the cited prior art either taken alone or in combination.

Tinsley teaches a closed rectangular box "which may be cylindrical in shape" (see column 4, lines 5-8) in which the **top wall of the container is fixedly coupled to the box and**

A

constitutes the dispensing wall. Therefore such a wall may be considered as carrying out the function of the applicant's disclosed hood 19 and thus cannot suggest to the skilled in the art the freely descending panel with the angular portions. Furthermore by stating that the shape of his container may be cylindrical Tinsley, in fact, points the skilled in the art away from what is an essential feature of the applicant's invention and not a mere design choice, i.e. the freely descending panel with angular portions.

It is furthermore submitted that Kawasaki teaches a container having all the drawbacks of the prior art devices.

As taught in the specification and clearly shown in figures (see figures 1, 2, 5, 6(c) and (d)) the resilient members 5, 120, which are curved upwards at the inner wall of the container, cannot prevent the outermost turns of wire from springing up and overriding the retaining member 4 through the **circular** gap it leaves between itself and the inner wall of the container.

The same cannot occur in the applicant's claimed invention where the **circular** turns of wire are retained by the panel with a **polygonal contour having angular portions**.

A further new and inventive combination of features is claimed in new independent claim 22. In order to render the container adapted for heavy coils "angular elements for confining the coil which are located at inner corners of the box shaped body" are further provided.

Such elements oppose the pressure exerted by the coiled wire which thus is not acting on the weaker sides of the

box. Furthermore a free space for ventilation is left between the wire coil and the container walls preventing moisture from condensing on the welding wire.

Last but not least, it is also submitted that the applicant claimed container (as set forth in particular in claims 13 and 27) is economical, more adapted for easy and efficient stacking and eventually can be dismantled and stacked in a small space for disposal and recycling.

By comparison, Kawasaki's container is built from a metallic drum which is even seen as an advantageous alternative to the paper (see column 3, lines 19-22 and 25-30).

Further inventive features of the applicant's invention are claimed in the new dependent claims.

Accordingly the newly submitted claims are believed to be in an allowable condition.

It will be noted that a sincere effort has been made to positively respond to all of the points raised by the Examiner.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly define the present invention and distinguish the same over the art of record, applicant would be open to any suggestion the Examiner may have concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines

the present invention.

Finally a request for one-month extension of time is herewith enclosed, in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted



Guido MODIANO

(Reg. No. 19,928)

Agent for the applicant

Via Meravigli 16

20123 MILAN-ITALY

Tel. +39-2-8692.442

Milan: August 24, 1994

Encl.: One-month extension of time, in duplicate.